THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
OCTOBER 10, 1980, IN LISNER
HALL, ROOM 603

1 The meeting was called to order at 2:12 p.m., by the President.

Present: President Elliott, Parliamentarian Cheh, Chitwood, Divita, Frey, Gallagher, Hawkins, Heddesheimer, Hill, Kirsch, Liebowitz, Linkowski, Mazzeo, Morgan, Packer, Park, Pierpont, Reiss, Robinson, Schiff, H. Solomon, L. Solomon, Steiner, Toridis, Wallace, and Ziolkowski

Absent: Provost Bright, Registrar Gebhardtsbauer, Barron, Birnbaum, Chandler, Fox, Griffith, Kelly, Linton, Loeser, Sapin, and Walker

2 The minutes of the regular meeting of September 12, 1980, were approved as distributed.

3 (a) On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Hill moved the adoption of Resolution 80/12, "A Resolution Supporting the Establishment of an Examination File," and the motion was seconded. Professor Hill said that he was prepared to defend this resolution against charges that it may be frivolous because he thought there were perhaps few things that so fully engaged the interest of students as did the nature of examinations. Although student leaders in the past have tried to maintain exam files in the Marvin Center or the Library, only to find exam copies ripped out and taken away, this time, he said, GWUSA planned to maintain one set of exams in the Library and a duplicate set under lock and key in the Student Association Office so that copies could be made in the event of pilferage at the Library. The advantage to the faculty was obvious, he thought, especially to those faculty who were dunned every year for copies of past examinations, and he urged the adoption of this resolution.

Professor Ziolkowski spoke against the resolution. Having consulted some faculty members, he found that many were very much opposed to this idea as being "educationally unsound." He said that some faculty felt that it could be misleading to students if they studied for one section and then happened to take the exam in another section, and others felt that permitting students access to past examinations might encourage them to miss classes in order to concentrate on reading up on past exams in the Library. Although it was really an individual matter, he said, much like "prayer in the classroom" and while he did not object to the students doing this on their own, he did not think it was appropriate for the Faculty Senate to encourage faculty participation in this matter, and, therefore, he opposed the resolution. Professor Hill responded that he thought the Faculty Senate had supported efforts of this sort in the past, and that passage of this resolution would by no means place any obligation on faculty members to cooperate if they chose not to. While he could see arguments on both sides,

he thought there may be faculty members who would view the matter of students looking over past exams as an educational benefit. Dean Solomon pointed out that the Graduate School has kept a file on Ph.D. and Master's comp's for many years with no pilferage. The question was called, the motion put, and Resolution 80/12 was adopted. [Resolution attached.]

3 (b) On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Hill moved the adoption of Resolution 80/13, "A Resolution Recommending Real Merit Increases in the Salaries of Deserving Faculty," and the motion was seconded. Professor Hill pointed out that the resolution lacked extensive "WHEREAS" clauses but he thought the Cibinic Committee Report itself served that purpose. He also noted that some members of the Special Committee were present to elaborate on parts of the report if that were needed. Essentially, he said, the Special Committee found that the University does not have a policy of granting cost-of-living increases in faculty salaries, nor did the committee recommend such a policy; rather it recommended retaining the University's present policy of recognizing merit as the principal basis for granting salary increases, and it further recommended that funds be made available for real merit increases to deserving faculty. This proposal, Professor Hill said, was not meant to siphon off funds from salary increases for faculty who were perhaps less deserving, but to make additional funds available for those faculty who were particularly productive. He said that although the Special Committee felt that it was not charged with the task of identifying the source of new money for this purpose, it did identify three possible sources: tuition increase, early retirement, and greater faculty productivity. Of these three sources, he said, the faculty had control over only the last one - productivity - and in this regard he would ask the Executive Committee to consider, once again, the whole question of faculty productivity and its measurements.

The President then recognized Professor Cibinic, Chairman of the Special Committee on Faculty Salary Problems as They Relate to the Increasing Cost-of-Living. Professor Cibinic said that if anyone had any questions concerning the report or tables that he or his colleague on the committee, Professor Kirsch, an eminent expert, would be happy to answer them. He also said he wished to thank all the members of his committee who contributed many hours during the past summer working on this project. With regard to the three potential sources of new money mentioned by Professor Hill, he said that it seemed to him that all of these sources must be utilized, especially tuition levels and faculty productivity, to make this work. In addition, Professor Cibinic said, the faculty needed to be concerned about "averages" to make certain that things didn't degenerate into everybody receiving an average raise unless everyone was considered to be average. He said he thought that there were variations and those should be recognized.

The President called upon Mr. William D. Johnson, Director of Planning and Budgeting, who presented a report on the "Status of the General Budget (Excluding the Medical Center) 1978/79 through 1981/82." [Mr. Johnson's report is attached and made a part of these minutes.]

Professor Kirsch said he wished to thank Mr. Johnson for his cooperation and openness in working with the Special Committee and for providing the materials necessary for this study. Professor Morgan said that, before he voted for a resolution asking the Administration to do something, he would want to know precisely

what it was he was asking them to do, and he was somewhat puzzled by this resolution which asked the Administration to make sufficient funds available for the next academic year to enable the granting of real merit increases in salary to deserving faculty members. The report, he said, did not recommend cost-of-living increases, concluding that that would be undesirable. Therefore, he said, if one received a raise not equal to a change in the cost-of-living, that would result in a real salary decrease, and, in terms of this report, a real merit increase would be a real increase above and beyond what was necessary to maintain the status quo. The implication was, as he saw it, that anyone who did not merit a real merit increase, but, on the other hand, did not deserve a real merit decrease, should get a cost-of-living increase. He asked whether the additional funds being asked for would be distributed in some manner differently from the way in which funds were presently distributed, and, if there was to be a change, precisely what that change would be. Professor Morgan said that while he automatically applauded a recommendation for increasing faculty salaries, he would like to know what "real merit increases to deserving faculty members" really meant before voting on this resolution.

Professor Cibinic responded that the committee, of course, had a somewhat limited scope of inquiry and could not get into a full examination of the total University budget in order to identify specific amounts; but basically it was recommending that the University provide additional funds so that recognition could be given to those faculty who deserved a greater increase in salary than others, and that that increase be based on merit, not cost-of-living. Professor Kirsch said that the committee did not wish to identify a specific amount because, as pointed out in the report, cost-of-living increases affected different faculty members differently. He explained that the committee felt that it was difficult to classify an increase as one of merit for superior performance if that increase merely allowed the faculty members to keep even with rising prices or resulted in a net reduction; therefore, he said, the committee believed that sufficient funds should be made available for the next academic year so that merit increases could be given to faculty members demonstrating superior performance without impairing funds for appropriate recognition of the majority of faculty members who have made substantial contributions to the University as well. Professor Morgan said that from the explanation given then, he would assume that the Senate would be voting on a recommendation that asked the University to make sufficient money available, in addition to what was necessary to maintain the cost-of-living for faculty, to grant real merit increases to deserving faculty, and, if that interpretation was correct, he would support the resolution wholeheartedly. Professor Kirsch responded affirmatively. Professor Cibinic responded that he didn't think the committee's report was mysterious, that it was obvious to the committee that more money than the University had provided in the past would have to be made available so that deserving faculty could be recognized; otherwise, he said, the committee would have recommended that everybody get cost-of-living increases across the board.

Further discussion followed by Professors Ziolkowski, Cibinic, Kirsch, Morgan, Hill, and Mazzeo. Professor Reiss asked what made this recommendation different from existing policy. Professor Cibinic replied that the University had changed two things - the budget position on tuition and on raises. Professor Hawkins said that it seemed to him there were other alternatives, in addition to

the item under discussion, for gaining real income without moving into a higher tax bracket which only eroded the faculty's financial position. He suggested that the University might wish to consider a flexible fringe benefit program which could be tailored to the individual's own unique cost-of-living problems. The discussion continued by Professors Park, Cibinic, Reiss, and Kirsch. The question was called and Resolution 80/13 with accompanying report, was adopted unanimously. [Resolution attached; report previously distributed with agenda.]

4 Under Introduction of Resolutions, Professor Hill, on behalf of the Executive Committee, introduced a draft resolution for the Senate's consideration at the November meeting. He said that this resolution would re-establish May 1st as the beginning and ending date of Senate sessions from the present March 1st date. He noted that the record was not altogether clear as to why the change was made in 1970, but if there were no objections to going back to the old system, the Executive Committee would propose the resolution formally at the November meeting. [Draft resolution attached.]

5 (a) Professor Hill reported that the Executive Committee had sent a letter to Deans and Chairmen of Curriculum Committees throughout the University asking them "to accept their share of the obligation to implement Resolution 80/10" adopted by the Senate last month. This resolution, he said, called on the faculty of the several schools to review and examine certain curricular requirements and restrictions pertaining to the enrollment of undergraduate students in courses other than those offered by the school or college in which they were registered. He noted that although this resolution was addressed to faculties, the Deans possessed certain inherent powers to initiate curricular reforms and the Deans, therefore, were urged to participate in this effort. Secondly, Professor Hill reported that the Executive Committee had asked the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students to undertake the quadrennial review of the Student Grievance Procedures, adopted in 1977 with the requirement that the procedures be reviewed by an appropriate committee of the Faculty Senate after four years. Further, he said that the Executive Committee had asked the Admissions Committee to make an inquiry into tuition levels but that that study might now be unnecesary since tuition levels were referred to in both the Cibinic report and Mr. Johnson's report.

(b) Professor Robinson, Chairman of the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee, reported that she was submitting a written report on the activities of her committee; however, she said she wished at this time to enter into the minutes a table showing salary distribution data for female faculty which was part of the Special Committee's study on faculty salaries. [Data sheet attached and made a part of these minutes.]

Professor Chitwood, Co-Chairman of the Joint Committee on Faculty and Students, reported that his committee, in addition to reviewing the Student Grievance Procedures, would be reviewing the Academic Dishonesty Policy that was brought before the Senate last spring and relating the changes to those being proposed in the Judicial Code. Also, he said, the Joint Committee would be reviewing the Charter of the committee. Another matter the students wished to pursue, he said, was the possibility of establishing a University Ombudsman for students, this to be a paid position such as exists at other universities. Finally, an inquiry by students as to the possibility of extending library hours was being conducted.

6 Under Brief Statements, Professor Hill announced that the Faculty Coffee House would be reopened on Wednesday, October 15th and that Reverend Joseph Smith who was the Baptist Chaplain on campus, had agreed to serve coffee to the faculty on Wednesdays from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., and he hoped the faculty would accept his kind invitation. On behalf of the Senate, Professor Hill said he wished to thank Professor Cibinic and the members of his committee, together with Mr. Johnson who worked with the committee, for their fine work on the faculty salary problems, and to discharge the committee at this time. Also, Professor Hill said he wished to express his personal admiration for the Administration's making a commitment to increase the amount of money set aside for faculty salary increases at a time when the University was heading into a deficit situation.

7 There was no further business to come before the meeting. Upon motion made and seconded, the President adjourned the meeting at 3:16 p.m.

Robert Gebhardtsbauer
Secretary

A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EXAMINATION FILE (80/12)

WHEREAS, faculty have generally cooperated with earlier student efforts to establish and maintain a file of past examinations, and

WHEREAS, student leaders (GWUSA) have apparently devised a new system for maintaining such a file against the inroads of pilferage; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That faculty be urged to respond favorably to the Student Association's requests for copies of past examinations for the purpose of maintaining a permanent file.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
September 26, 1980

Adopted October 10, 1980

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING REAL MERIT INCREASES IN THE SALARIES OF DESERVING FACULTY (80/13)

WHEREAS, the Special Senate Committee on Faculty Salary Problems As They Relate to the Increasing Cost of Living has made its report, dated September 18, 1980, and that report has been distributed with the call for the October meeting of the Faculty Senate; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That this report be forwarded to the University Administration with the approval of the Faculty Senate, and that the Administration be asked to make sufficient funds available for the next academic year to enable the granting of real merit increases in salary to deserving faculty members.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
September 26, 1980

Adopted October 10, 1980

Faculty Senate

October 10, 1980

Report on the Status of the General Budget (Excluding the Medical Center)

1978/79 through 1981/82

The University incurred an operating deficit in the general fund for each of the last two years -- $778,000 in 1978/79 and $1,500,000 in 1979/80. The budget for the current year will result in a similar deficit to the extent of $1,900,000. At June 30, 1980 there was an unappropriated balance of $2,000,000 in the general fund, and the current year's deficit will eliminate that remaining resource.

In May the Board of Trustees approved a revision in the 1980/81 budget which incorporated an energy surcharge. The deficit for the year at that time was estimated to be $360,000. As a result of registration this Fall we are $1,000,000 under our tuition estimates for 1980/81. This shortfall occurred primarily in the College of General Studies, which experienced a sharp decline in registrations from last Fall and in the Schools of Engineering and Applied Science and Government and Business Administration, neither of which had the total increase in enrollment that had been estimated. Also it appears that the recovery of indirect costs from sponsored programs will be under the budget estimate by $300,000. The balance of the deficit, $220,000, is accounted for by smaller variations, both plus and minus, in other income and expense categories.

The materials, including forms and guidelines for preparation of the 1981/82 budget, were distributed to Deans and other administrative officers on October 8 and 9. This budget is predicated on the same level of enrollment as occurred this Fall, except for an estimated 5% increase in the School of Government and Business Administration.

Funds have been provided to increase salaries generally by 10%. Also provision has been made for increasing salaries of non-academic personnel in the lower salary grades (2 through 9) on average by an additional 3%. A similar supplementary provision has been made for increasing salaries of instructors and assistant professors in Columbian College, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and the Schools of Education and Human Development and Public and International Affairs.

Non-salary expenses have been increased by 7% and additional funding has been provided for:

1. The School of Government and Business Administration	$250,000
2. Gelman Library	100,000
3. Renovation of Chemistry Laboratories	300,000

Finally, provision has been made to cover the required debt service and maintenance and operation expense of the Academic Cluster for the six months it will be occupied during 1981/82. This amounts to about $1,500,000.

Application of the currently projected tuition rates for 1981/82, along with the planned increases in salaries and other expenses, will produce an operating deficit in 1981/82 in excess of

$3,000,000. Obviously none of us can permit this to happen.

The only course of action available to us is to increase tuition rates for 1981/82 significantly beyond what has been projected. We are planning to do this, painful as it might be, and in doing so the energy surcharge will be eliminated as a separate fee.

It is much too early to predict what the new tuition rates will be. All budgets for both the current year and 1981/82 will be subjected to the most careful scrutiny for possible savings. Requests for increases in current levels of funding or those provided for next year simply will not be considered unless they include clearly identified sources of new income to support them. Also it is only prudent to observe trends in the cost of energy and the weather for as long as possible.

Whatever the new tuition rates may be, it is a certainty that they will be substantially below those of our peer institutions both locally and around the nation.

What I have attempted to do is to lay before you the major factors which are influencing the general operations of the University, semester to semester and year to year. When a general budget presentation is made before a forum such as this, there is no logical end to what can be said or discussed. Let me assure you, however, that there will be ample opportunity provided to those who wish it for full discussion of all aspects of the budget during the current budget cycle.

To conclude on a positive note, I can state confidently that the University is in a strong financial position in spite of

these temporary but unfortunate aberrations in the annual operating budget. The addition to the Henry Building is now underway and the development of 2000 Eye Street and the old Medical School Property is on the horizon. Thus, we can anticipate some favorable income additions after 1981/82 from a source other than very large annual increases in tuition rates.

William D. Johnson, Director
Planning and Budgeting

SALARY DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE FACULTY

FACULTY SALARY AVERAGES 1979-1980

	FEMALES		MALES		Combined
	#	Average	#	Average	Average
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE					
Professors	12	$ 26,600	95	$ 30,100	$ 29,700
Associates	17	20,600	60	21,800	21.600
Assistants	23	15,500	44	16,000	15,800
EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT					
Professors	8	29,700	16	28,600	28,950
Associates	6	23,100	7	21,900	22,400
Assistants	4	18,400	4	18,700	18,600
ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCE					
Professors			34	32,000	32,000
Associates			19	25,400	25,400
Assistants			5	21,800	21,800
GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION					
Professors	*		27	32,600	32,400
Associates	*		25	25,300	25,300
Assistants	*		12	22,700	22,600
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES	*		*		
NATIONAL LAW CENTER					
Professors	*		28	42,100	41,900
PUBLIC AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS					
Professors	*		6	33,200	33,100
Associates			4	25,600	25,600
Assistants			*		*

COMBINED				
Professors	24	29,000	207	32,300
Associates	25	21,500	115	23,300
Assistants	31	16,600	69	17,900

SUMMARY - ALL COMBINED		
Professors	231	32,000
Associates	140	23,000
Assistants	100	17,500

* Number of cases too few to publish for reasons of privacy.

Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies
(including Fringe Benefits)
October 10, 1980

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

October 6, 1980

To the Faculty Senate
From its Executive Committee

(TO BE CONSIDERED AT THE NOVEMBER MEETING OF THE SENATE)

DRAFT RESOLUTION to re-establish May 1 as the beginning/ending date of Senate sessions and of the terms of Senate members:

Whereas in 1965 Senate sessions and the terms of office of Senate members were scheduled to begin and end on May 1; and

Whereas in 1970 sessions and terms of office were altered to begin and end at the "first regular Senate meeting in March;" and

Whereas Senate Committees often find it difficult to complete their business prior to mid-March; and incoming Committees find it equally difficult to generate momentum between the March and May meetings, therefore:

Be It Resolved by the Faculty Senate of The George Washington University:

(1) That the Faculty Senate petition the President to propose to the next Faculty Assembly that the Faculty Organization Plan and the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate be amended to effect a return to May 1 as the beginning/ending date of Senate sessions and the terms of Senate members;

(2) That such amendments, upon approval by the Assembly, shall take effect in the spring of 1982, at that time extending the Senate session and the terms of office of Senate members to May 1, 1982;

(3) That to accomplish the intent of this resolution the Assembly is asked to approve the following specific amendments:

(a) to substitute "beginning on May 1 of the year in which they are elected" for "beginning with the first regular Senate meeting in March of the year of election"--in Art. III-2-c of the Faculty Organization Plan (p. 4);

(b) to substitute "March 15" for "February 15"--in the sentence that reads: "The elections shall be held at meetings called by the academic deans of the respective schools prior to February 15 of each year,"--in Art. III-3-4, ibid.;

(c) to substitute "May" for "March"--in the sentence that reads: "The business year of the Senate shall be called a 'session' and each session shall commence with the call to order of the regular meeting in March," --in Appendix II: Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, Sec. 1-c.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate October 1, 1980

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, October 10, 1980, at 2:10 p.m, in the Faculty Conference Room, Sixth Floor, Lisner Hall.

AGENDA

1. Call to order

2. Minutes of the regular meeting of September 12, 1980

3. Resolutions:

 (a) A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EXAMINATION FILE (80/12), Professor Peter P. Hill, Chairman, Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate (resolution attached)

 (b) A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING REAL MERIT INCREASES IN THE SALARIES OF DESERVING FACULTY (80/13), with accompanying Report and Tables, Professor Peter P. Hill, Chairman, Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate (resolution, report and tables attached)

4. Introduction of Resolutions

5. General Business:

 (a) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Peter P. Hill, Chairman

 (b) Interim Reports of Senate Standing Committees

6. Brief Statements

7. Adjournment

Robert Gebhardtsbauer
Secretary

A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EXAMINATION FILE (80/12)

WHEREAS, faculty have gnerally cooperated with earlier student efforts to establish and maintain a file of past examinations, and

WHEREAS, student leaders (GWUSA) have apparently devised a new system for maintaining such a file against the inroads of pilferage; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That faculty be urged to respond favorably to the Student Association's requests for copies of past examinations for the purpose of maintaining a permanent file.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
September 26, 1980

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING REAL MERIT INCREASES IN THE SALARIES OF DESERVING FACULTY (80/13)

WHEREAS, the Special Senate Committee on Faculty Salary Problems As They Relate to the Increasing Cost of Living has made its report, dated September 18, 1980, and that report has been distributed with the call for the October meeting of the Faculty Senate; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That this report be forwarded to the University Administration with the approval of the Faculty Senate, and that the Administration be asked to make sufficient funds available for the next academic year to enable the granting of real merit increases in salary to deserving faculty members.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
September 26, 1980

September 18, 1980

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON FACULTY SALARY PROBLEMS AS THEY RELATE TO THE INCREASING COST OF LIVING

TO: Faculty Senate

Introduction

This Committee which was appointed by the Faculty Senate on April 11, 1980 was charged with inquiring "into measures which the University Administration and/or the Faculty might take to narrow the growing disparity between increases in faculty salaries and increases in the cost of living." Initially, the Committee decided to (1) determine the University's policy with respect to salary increases, (2) quantify the rates of salary increases over the past several years and, (3) select appropriate measures of the cost of living increases during this same period of time. The Committee then considered a number of different approaches to the problem of lessening the impact of inflation on faculty standards of living.

Time and budget constraints have dictated that the Committee use existing and readily available data to the greatest extent possible. Thus, not all data are directly comparable. However, the Committee believes that possible inconsistencies are minor and that data used are quite satisfactory. Greater comparability and consistency would involve greatly increased costs with, we believe, no appreciable effect upon our conclusions or recommendations.

Data collected by the Committee are summarized in Tables 1 - 7 which are included as Appendices to this Report. Also included is a brief explanation of the data covered in each table. The Committee expresses its appreciation to William D. Johnson for his assistance in obtaining much of the information contained in these tables.

University Policy

The Committee was informed that the University's present policy for faculty members is to give merit increases only, and not to give cost of living increases. Further, the University administration, in its annual budget guidelines to vice-presidents, deans and department heads, provides for an average rate for salary increases for the entire faculty. Individual increases may be greater or lower, based upon the discretion of the vice-president, dean or department head. President Elliott's October 8, 1979 memorandum dealing with the 1980-1981 budget made the following comments concerning the 8% average increase in faculty salaries provided for in the budget:

"It is recognized that this average salary increase is inadequate to offset the predicted rate of inflation or increase in the Consumer Price Index."

"As in most institutions salaries cannot be increased as rapidly as the cost of living increases."

It is the Committee's understanding that budget projections for future years were based on maintaining an average of 8% for faculty salary increases.

Cost of Living Increases

The faculty does not need the Committee to advise it that the cost of living has been increasing at a great rate. However, Table 7 shows the rate of increase for the past 3 years, using two national indices and comparative costs for the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. It is recognized that the impact of increases in the cost of living can be drastically different based upon the income level and budget of an individual faculty member. Whether the faculty member is a home owner or renter, the number and ages of children, and other factors can significantly affect the degree to which price rises in particular commodities or services will affect the individual's standard of living. The Committee notes that the impact may be particularly severe on a younger faculty member. However, an individual's needs are a highly personal matter. Thus, there may be many instances where price increases create greater difficulties for older faculty members. What is apparent is that regardless of the individual's needs, the cost of living has increased markedly in the last two years. The percentage increase reflected in Table 7 has been in the 8% to 11% range.

Past Faculty Salary Increases

The Committee's information is based upon averages since it was impossible to obtain and analyze data for individual faculty members. Thus, the Committee cannot determine the extent to which individual salary increases were greater or lower than the averages. We would expect numerous such cases. However, from information available to Committee members, it was apparent that in some departments the variation from average was relatively small.

The average faculty salary increases reflected in Table 4 show the most recent rate of increases to be in the 7% to 8% range, substantially lower than the cost of living increases shown in Table 7 to be in the 8% to 11% range. Tables 1, 2 and 3 also indicate what appears to be a slight decline with respect to the relative position of our faculty salaries compared to those of other educational institutions.

The erosion of faculty salaries both in terms of cost of living and relative standing should be compared with tuition changes over the same period. Table 5 shows past, present and projected tuition rates for the University. Table 6 reflects the fact that our tuition rates are much lower than those of the other private universities in Washington, D.C.

Conclusions

a. Need For Action

If the demonstrated erosion of faculty salaries continues, the consequences for the faculty, and thus the institution are likely to be serious. A

number of departments have already been having difficulty in recruiting younger faculty members, in recruiting established scholars who would have to move into this area, and in retaining some of their most able members. This situation must be recognized and appropriate action taken.

b. Retain Merit Increase Policy

The Committee has concluded that it would not be in the best interests of the University to attempt to resolve the problem by instituting a policy providing for across the board cost of living increases. We believe that such a policy might have a negative effect on motivating faculty performance. The Committee can envision situations where faculty performance would be such as to call for no increase or an increase which is lower than the average provided. Similarly, superior performance should be recognized by meaningful raises which may be well above the increase in the cost of living. However, this recognition of clearly superior performance should not be allowed to impair appropriate recognition for the majority of faculty members who have made substantial contributions to the University.

c. Additional Funds Needed for Merit Increases

The Committee believes that the funds made available for salary increases in the most recent periods have been insufficient for equitable recognition of faculty performance. It is difficult to classify an increase as one of merit for superior performance if it merely allows the faculty member to keep even with rising prices or results in a net reduction of the individual's purchasing power. Thus, the Committee believes that sufficient funds should be made available for the next academic year to enable deans and department heads to grant true merit increases to deserving faculty members.

d. Source of Funds

The Committee does not consider its charter to include the determination of the specific amount of funds which should be made available or to designate the specific sources of such funds. However, the Committee has discussed a number of areas which should be considered. An obvious source of funds might be a tuition increase. It is recognized that there are those who may fear that a tuition increase could have a negative impact on enrollment and thus yield a result which is the reverse of that intended. The Committee does not deny such a risk exists but it considers that at least an equally serious risk exists in continuing the status quo. Another possibility which the Committee feels should be considered is an early or partial retirement program. While this is not viewed as a major source of additional compensation, it could assist in solving this serious problem. Finally, the Committee recognizes that scholarly productivity as evidenced by teaching, research and publication is a major factor in determining institutional revenues and expenses. Thus, the faculty and administration should encourage the individual schools and colleges to continue and to expand their efforts to gain greater productivity from faculty members.

Ali B. Cambel
William D. Johnson, ex officio
Richard A. Kenney
Arthur D. Kirsch
Martha N. Rashid
Charles T. Stewart
John Cibinic, Jr., Chairman

NOTE: For a summation of the Committee's recommendations, please see Senate Resolution 80/13 attached.

August 20, 1980
ADK

TABLES 1 - 6

The data reported in Tables 1-6 was originally furnished to this Committee by Mr. William Johnson, Director of Planning and Budgeting, and have been reformatted for this report. Some minor variations may be found between tables due to rounding or to the requirements of the uses of the original data; however, no differences of significant magnitude should exist.

Table 1 shows the decile distributions of average faculty compensation (includes fringe benefits) for all Class I Universities as reported by the American Association of University Professors, for 1976 through 1979. The table also gives the GWU average at each rank. These figures include all faculty except for those in the School of Medicine.

Table 2 shows the same data for average faculty salaries, (not including fringe benefits) but was only available for 1978 and 1979. Note that while Professors were just above the 80th percentile in 1978, they are slighly below it in 1979. This slight drop in relative standing to all Class I universities is also shown for associate professors, but not for assistant professors.

Table 3 shows comparisons of both compensation and salary with selected universities. Note that the compensation and salary levels for all ranks falls below Georgetown, and, except for assistant professors, above American and Catholic Universities.

Table 4 provides a great deal of detail for the salary history of GWU from 1976 through 1979. It gives the average salaries by rank and school, and the number in each faculty in 1979. In addition, it gives the percent increase given each year to the entire continuing faculty and for 1979 only, to the continuing faculty remaining in the same rank. Thus, while continuing assistant professors received an 8.9 increase in 1979, when the data is computed for those remaining as assistant professors (not promoted) the percent increase drops to 7.8.

The table also shows the guidelines for raises given by the administration to the various schools.

Table 5 presents (for all schools) the tuition history of GWU from 1977, projected through 1983, while Table 6 shows the undergraduate tuition rates for GWU, American, Catholic, and Georgetown from 1975 through 1980. Please note the change from basically similar rates for all universities in 1975 to the much lower tuition rate for GWU in 1980.

TABLE 1

DECILE DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE FACULTY COMPENSATION

1976/77 - 1979/80

		1976/77		1977/78		1978/79		1979/80	
		AAUP	GWU	AAUP	GWU	AAUP	GWU	AAUP	GWU
PROFESSOR	90	34,270		35,370		39,100		41,400	
					33,100				
	80	31,310		32,710		35,520		38,500	
			31,200				35,400		37,600
	70	29,890		31,610		34,500		36,600	
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	90	24,420		25,270		27.170		29,700	
	80	23,230		24,430		26,200		28,200	
			22,800		24,200		25,600		
	70	22,430		23,650		25,560		27,500	27,500
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	70	18,210		19,140		20,510		22,100	
	60	17,810		18,810		20,240		21,600	
									21,200
	50	17,510		18,450		19,790		21,100	
			17,500		18,200		19,700		
	40	17,120		17,950		19,480		20,700	

)

TABLE 2

DECILE DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE FACULTY SALARIES

George Washington University

		1978/79		1979/80		Number in Rank 1979/80
		AAUP	GWU	AAUP	GWU	
A. Excluding Medical School						
PROFESSOR	90	32,280		34,700		
			30,600			
	80	30,040		32,300		
					32,000	
	70	29,080		31,200		
	60			30,400		231
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	90	22,890		24,500		
	80	22,100		23,600		
			21,900			
	70	21,660		23,200		
					23,000	
	60			22,900		140
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	90	18,010		19,600		
	80	17,730		19,000		
	70	17,460		18,700		
	60	17,180		18,300		
	50	16,970		18,000		
	40	16,690		17,800		
	30	16,520		17,500		
			16,500		17,500	
	20	16,190				100
B. Medical School (Basic Sciences Only)						
PROFESSOR			35,000		36,900	
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR			28,800		31,100	
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR			20,700		23,500	

TABLE 3

FACULTY COMPENSATION at SELECTED CATEGORY I UNIVERSITIES

(Plus FACULTY SALARY COMPARISONS of LOCAL UNIVERSITIES)
(1978/79)

I. Compensation Comparisons with Selected Universities: (in 000's)	Prof	Assoc Prof	Asst Prof
Harvard	44.3	24.7	20.4
Stanford	40.8	28.0	22.3
University of Chicago	39.9	26.8	21.7
Johns Hopkins	39.8	28.0	20.4
Columbia	39.6	27.3	20.3
University of Pennsylvania	39.6	27.9	22.1
University of Pittsburgh	36.9	26.2	20.4
University of Southern California	36.1	26.6	22.0
Brown	35.9	25.2	19.5
New York University	35.5	25.4	21.1
George Washington University	35.4	25.6	19.7
University of Rochester	35.4	25.8	20.1
Washington University (St. Louis)	34.1	24.5	20.5
Vanderbilt	34.0	24.3	19.2
Syracuse	33.6	25.1	19.6
University of Maryland	32.4	24.3	19.8
Emory	30.8	24.0	19.7
Tulane	29.0	23.4	18.4
II. Compensation Comparisons with Local Universities: (in 000's)			
University of District of Columbia (Category II A)	36.5	28.7	23.4
Georgetown	36.1	27.5	20.6
George Washington University	35.4	25.6	19.7
Howard	34.4	25.5	21.1
American	31.1	23.7	19.2
Catholic	27.2	21.0	17.7
III. Average Salary Comparisons with Local Universities: (in 000's)			
University of District of Columbia (Category II A)	30.5	23.9	19.6
Georgetown	31.1	23.1	17.1
George Washington University	30.6	21.9	16.5
Howard	30.0	21.9	18.0
American	26.3	20.0	16.7
Catholic	24.6	18.8	16.1

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY (Excluding the Medical Center)
Average Faculty Salaries
1976/77 - 1979/80

Table 4

	1976/77 Average Salary	1976/77 % increase over prior year	1977/78 Average Salary	1977/78 % increase over prior year	1978/79 Average Salary	1978/79 % increase over prior year	1979/80 Average Salary	1979/80 % increase over prior year	N
PROFESSORS									
Columbian College	25,800	4.0	26,800	3.9	28,100	4.9	29,700	4.9	107
Education and Human Development	24,500	5.2	25,800	5.3	27,200	5.4	29,000	6.6	24
Engineering and Applied Science	27,300	3.4	28,300	3.7	30,700	8.5	32,000	4.2	34
Government and Business Administration	27,000	4.3	28,500	5.9	30,800	7.7	32,500	5.5	28
Graduate Arts and Sciences	*		*		*		*		1
National Law Center	33,500	7.7	35,800	6.9	38,100	6.4	41,900	10.0	30
Public and International Affairs	28,500	5.2	30,300	6.3	32,900	8.6	33,100	0.6	7
Combined (AAUP)	27,300	4.6	28,700	5.1	30,600	6.6	32,000	4.6	231
% Increase - Continuing Faculty (AAUP)		6.0		6.7		7.8		7.9	
% Increase - Continuing Faculty in Same Rank								7.9	
ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS									
Columbian College	18,700	5.7	19,500	4.3	20,900	7.2	21,600	3.4	77
Education and Human Development	19,100	2.1	20,300	6.3	20,800	2.5	22,400	7.7	13
Engineering and Applied Science	20,200	14.1	21,400	5.9	22,700	6.1	25,400	12.0	19
Government and Business Administration	21,700	6.4	23,100	6.5	24,400	5.6	25,300	3.7	27
Public and International Affairs	21,700	4.3	22,200	2.3	23,900	7.7	25,600	7.1	4
Combined (AAUP)	19,600	6.5	20,600	5.1	21,900	6.3	23,000	5.0	140
% Increase - Continuing Faculty (AAUP)		7.2		7.2		9.0		7.4	
% Increase - Continuing Faculty in Same Rank								7.0	
ASSISTANT PROFESSORS									
Columbian College	14,000	2.9	14,600	4.3	15,400	5.5	15,800	2.6	67
Education and Human Development	15,300	1.3	15,600	2.0	16,700	7.1	18,600	11.4	8
Engineering and Applied Science	17,100	7.6	18,600	8.8	18,400		21,800	18.5	5
Government and Business Administration	19,100	6.7	20,100	5.2	21,300	6.0	22,600	6.1	15
Graduate Arts and Sciences	*		*		*		*		3
Public and International Affairs	*		*		*		*		2
Combined (AAUP)	14,900	3.5	15,300	2.7	16,500	7.8	17,500	6.1	100
% Increase - Continuing Faculty (AAUP)		7.0		7.5		9.2		8.9	
% Increase - Continuing Faculty in Same Rank								7.8	
GUIDELINES		4%, 3% & 3%**		6.5%**		8%**		7%**	

* Number of cases too few to publish for reasons of privacy.

**In 1976/77 a "minimum" increase was directed: 4% on first $20,000
3% on salary over $20,000

In addition to the above minimum 3% was provided for discretionary increases.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Table 5

Tuition Rates Projected to 1983-84

	1977-78		1978-79		1979-80		1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84	
	Full-time	Hourly	Full-time	Hourly	Full-time	Hourly	Full-time	Hourly	Full-time	Hourly	Full-time	Hourly	Full-time	Hourly
Arts and Sciences:														
Undergraduate	2,800	105	3,000	110	3,200	117	3,400	125	3,700	136	4,100	150	4,500	165
Graduate		105		110		117		125		136		150		165
Engineering and Applied Science	2,900	107	3,100	112	3,400	119	3,700	137	3,900	145	4,300	159	4,700	174
Law - Currently enrolled Students	2,800	107	3,000	112										
Students entering in or after Fall Semester 1976	3,100	120	3,600	145	4,100	165	4,600	185	5,100	205	5,700	230	*	*
School of Medicine-														
Medical Students			11,800		11,800		11,800		*		*		*	
1st year students	9,000		9,600		11,800		11,800		*		*		*	
2nd year students	7,500		8,100		9,600		11,800		*		*		*	
3rd & 4th year students	6,000		6,500		8,100		9,600		*		*		*	
Summer Sessions		-		105		110		117		125		136		150
Off-Campus Programs		-		82		88		94		102		112		123
Government and Business Admin. Degrees of Doctor of Business Administration & Public Administration Students entering in:		-	8,500		9,000		9,600		10,250		11,350		12,450	

* Not projected

TABLE 6

Full time Undergraduate Tuition

Local Universities

	George Washington	American	Catholic	Georgetown
1975/76	2,500	2,934	2,696	2,900
1976/77	2,600	3,064	2,950	3,250
1977/78	2,800	3,240	3,200	3,500
1978/79	3,000	3,690	3,450	4,100
1979/80	3,200	4,080	3,750	4,450
1980/81	3,400 (1)	4,620	4,250	4,970 (2)

NOTES:

(1) Does not include energy surcharge of $100 per year.

(2) Indicated rate of $4,970 applies to freshmen. Others will pay $4,770

TABLE 7

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

July 12, 1980

To: Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Salaries

From: Charles Stewart

Subject: Cost of Living indices

Presented below are two CPI (Consumer Price Index) indices and the Urban Family Budget data for the last three years, expressed as percentage changes.

	CONSUMER PRICE INDEX		URBAN FAMILY BUDGET		
	Dec. to Dec.	year to year	higher	intermediate	lower
1976-1977	6.8%	6.5%	6.1%	5.4%	4.4%
1977-1978	9.0	7.7	8.8	8.9	10.2
1978-1979	13.3	11.3	10.6	10.2	9.0

The differences between the consumer price indices and the family budget are as follows:

1. The family budget is for a metropolitan family of specified income. For Fall 1979, this was $31,187 for the higher budget, $20,935 for the intermediate budget, and $12,722 for the lower budget. CPI indices since January 1978 are for all urban consumers; previously they were for urban wage earners and clerical workers.

2. The family budget is more comprehensive than the CPI, including items other than consumption, most important of which are personal taxes and social security contributions.

3. The family budget refers explicitly to cost of living, whereas the CPI refers to current prices. The important difference is in treatment of the costs of home ownership, which to a considerable extent are determined by prices in the year in which the house was bought, and not by current prices. The family budget assumes that homes were bought six years ago, reflecting housing prices and interest rates at that time.

Two consumer price indices are presented, the year to year and the December to December. The year to year, which represents an average over 12 months, is more stable and more meaningful than December to December, with single-month endpoints, subject to all sorts of temporary factors as well as to larger statistical measurement errors. But the last does reflect

the most recent trends (through December 1979) better than the year-to-year comparison. By far the largest percentage increases in the past year were the cost of energy and of home ownership.

Three family budgets are presented, with the higher budget more appropriate for professors, less appropriate for assistant professors. Note that percentage changes were greatest for the high income budget this past year, but smallest for the year before that. There is no predictable pattern. The main reason for the differential changes in cost is changes in personal taxes and social security contributions.

Which index is most appropriate? Clearly the family budget indices are more pertinent and complete indicants of changes in cost of living for most faculty. They include income taxes and social security, not just consumption. They are also calibrated for several income levels, which the CPI is not. Finally, they are estimated by metropolitan area, including the Washington SMSA. The comparative costs of living in Washington, all metropolitan areas, and all urban areas are given below:

	Fall 1977			Fall 1978			Fall 1979		
	High	Int.	Low	High	Int.	Low	High	Int.	Low
Urban U.S.	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Metro Areas	103	102	101	103	102	101	103	102	101
Washington SMSA	105	105	106	108	108	107	108	108	108

For faculty which has purchased a house very recently, or is about to do so in the immediate future, the CPI could be a better indication of cost of consumption changes, since it includes the current cost of housing, mortgages, etc., whereas the family budget includes the cost six years back. For faculty which purchased a house a long time ago, when prices and interest rates were much lower, but is still paying substantial interest, all these indices overstate the increase in cost of consumption. Faculty recently hired is likely to be renting, with rents fully reflecting current prices, whereas faculty hired in the past is likely to live in its own home, sheltered to some extent from recent sharp rises in both rentals and costs of home ownership.

In sum, the recent year to year changes in the CPI set an upper bound to changes in consumption costs, the changes in family budget costs are the best indicators of costs of living trends for many faculty, but even they overstate changes for faculty who bought homes when prices and interest rates were lower than they were six years ago (8% in 1973, 9% in 1974). In the future, should mortgage interest rates drop charply, family budget indices may overstate the increase in cost of living for recently hired faculty. In sum, there is no one best index of changes in living costs for all faculty all the time.